IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

PETER WENDT,)		
Plaintiff,)		
v.	Case No.		
TELELOGIC NORTH AMERICA, INC.,) Judge		
) FILED STAMP: JULY 30, 2008		
Defendent) 08CV4334		
Defendant.) JUDGE LEINENWEBER		
COMPLAI	NT MAG. JUDGE KEYS		
	.T M		

Plaintiff, Peter Wendt, by his attorneys, for his Complaint against Defendant Telelogic North America, Inc., states as follows:

Nature of the Action

This is an action pursuant to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), 29 U.S.C. §§ 621-634, et seq., seeking to redress unlawful employment practices on the basis of age. Plaintiff complains that Defendant violated the ADEA by refusing to hire him in favor of a younger, less qualified person.

Jurisdiction of Venue

- 2. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343. All administrative requirements have been satisfied in that the Plaintiff timely filed a Charge of Discrimination with the EEOC and now timely files this Complaint within ninety (90) days of having received his Notice of Right to Sue from the EEOC. A copy of the Right to Sue Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 3. Venue is proper because the unlawful conduct alleged herein was committed within the boundaries of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.

Parties

- 4. Plaintiff Peter Wendt is a 63 year old resident of Cook County, Illinois.
- 5. Defendant Telelogic North America, Inc. is an "employer" as that term is defined by the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. 621 et seq., is engaged in an industry affecting commerce, and employed more than twenty people during each work week during 2007 and 2008.
- 6. Plaintiff applied for employment with Defendant to fill the position of Midwest Regional Sales Representative. Plaintiff is a highly experienced salesperson and was qualified to fill the job position of Midwest Regional Sales Representative.
- 7. On or about February 4, 2008, Defendant informed Plaintiff that he would not be hired for employment by Defendant. Among Defendant's articulated reasons for not hiring Plaintiff was that Defendant preferred to hire younger, less experienced sales people because such persons are more adaptable to change, more eager to sell, and are more aggressive and dynamic.
- 8. In Plaintiff's stead, Defendant hired a younger less qualified employee for the job position of Midwest Regional Sales Representative.
- 9. Defendant refused to hire Plaintiff for the job position of Midwest Regional Sales Representative because of his age.
- 10. Defendant's refusal to hire Plaintiff on account of his age constitutes a material adverse employment action in violation of the ADEA.
- 11. Defendant's unlawful actions against Plaintiff have caused Plaintiff to suffer injury and damages

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for entry of judgment in his favor and against Defendant and for all appropriate relief available under the ADEA.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 30, 2008

s/Douglas M. Werman
Douglas M. Werman
Maureen A. Bantz
Werman Law Office, P.C.
77 W. Washington, Suite 1402
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 419-1008

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT A

EEOC Form 161-B (3/98)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

MOTION OF PIGUETO SUE (ISSUED ON PROVIDENT)

		NC	TICE OF RIGHT TO	SUE (ISSUED C	N REQUEST)			
To: Peter Wendt 1098 Horizon Dr. Bartlett, IL 60103			From:						
C	ertifie	d Mail 7001 1940 0003 8	3824 2850						
		On behalf of person(s) aggr CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §							
EEOC C	harge	No.	EEOC Represer	ntative		Telephone No.			
			Gloria M. Ma	yfield,					
440-20	008-04	4013	Investigator			(312) 353-0906			
Morior -		PERSON AGGRIEVED:		(See als	o the additional i	nformation enclosed with this form.)			
Title VII under Ti the ADA	of the itie VII	Civil Rights Act of 190 and/or the ADA based of the filed in a federal of	on the above-numbered c	harge. It has been is DAYS of your recei	sued at your req	your Notice of Right to Sue, issued uest. Your lawsuit under Title VII or e; or your right to sue based on this			
		More than 180 days have	e passed since the filing o	of this charge.					
		Less than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge, but I have determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will be able to complete its administrative processing within 180 days from the filing of this charge.							
	The EEOC is terminating its processing of this charge.								
		The EEOC will continue	to process this charge.						
Age Dis 90 days your cas	after	nation in Employment A you receive notice that w	Act (ADEA): You may sucted the completed action	e under the ADEA at a on the charge. In the	any time from 60 is regard, the pa	days after the charge was filed until ragraph marked below applies to			
X		The EEOC is closing your case. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA must be filed in federal or state court <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u> of your receipt of this Notice. Otherwise, your right to sue based on the above-numbered charge will be lost.							
	The EEOC is continuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days have passed since the filing of the charge, you may file suit in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.								
in federa	al or st	ate court within 2 years (ve the right to sue under to (3 years for willful violation an 2 years (3 years) bef	ns) of the alleged EP/	underpayment.	equired.) EPA suits must be brought This means that backpay due for ole.			
If you file	e suit, l	based on this charge, plea	ase send a copy of your co	ourt complaint to this o	ffice.				
Enclosi	ures(s)	70	On behalf of the Co	ommission P PW	7/25/2007			
	•			John P. Rowe, District Director		• (Басе манец)			
cc:	TE	LELOGIC NORTH AME	RICA, INC.						